



American Bank Building Suite 600  
621 SW Morrison Street  
Portland, OR 97205

Tel: 503-224-2170  
Fax: 503-224-2084

### **FAX COVER SHEET**

To: Examiner Chris A. Nelson  
Company: USPTO  
Fax No. (571) 270-8256  
From: Michael A. Cofield  
Reg. No. 54,630  
RE: U.S. Application No. 09/810,716 – Interview Request  
No. of Pages: 3

---

Examiner Nelson,

Attached is a copy of an interview request form and agenda for our Thursday telephone interview.

Sincerely,

/Michael A. Cofield/

#### **CONFIDENTIAL AND PRIVILEGED INFORMATION**

*This facsimile transmission contains confidential attorney/client privileged information and is for use by the intended recipient only. Distribution or any other use of this transmission by anyone other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you receive this transmission in error, please notify the sender immediately.*

## Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 09/810,716 First Named Applicant: Hiang-Swee CHIANG  
 Examiner: Chris A. Nelson Art Unit: 2193 Status of Application: Pending

### Tentative Participants:

(1) Michael A. Cofield (2) Chris A. Nelson  
 (3) \_\_\_\_\_ (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Proposed Date of Interview: 12/16 Proposed Time: 2 PM EST AM/PM

### Type of Interview Requested:

(1) ☒ Telephonic (2) ☐ Personal (3) ☐ Video Conference

Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ YES ☐ NO

If yes, provide brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

### Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) <u>Rejection</u>	<u>All claims</u>	<u>As cited in OA</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

☐ Continuation Sheet Attached

### Brief Description of Argument to be Presented:

Agenda attached herewith on a separate page.

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on \_\_\_\_\_.

**NOTE:** This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature  
Michael A. Cofield  
 Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative  
54,630

Examiner/SPE Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Registration Number, if applicable \_\_\_\_\_

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.133. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 21 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.  
 If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

A first point for the agenda is as follows:

Regarding claim 27, can you please review where the following claim feature is alleged to be found in the cited art: "the computing system retrieving an application framework code from an application directory".

The Office Action seems to contend that this feature is disclosed in Lindhorst col. 19, lines 14-29 and 61-67. This particular section of Lindhorst describes retrieving "canned actions". The "canned actions" are shown in tables 3 and 4. Accordingly, the Examiner seems to be alleging that the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claim term "application framework code" includes "canned actions".

Even if this BRI analysis is correct (applicant does not concede that it is), can we come up with some clarifying amendments that will cause the examined claim scope for this term to more closely match the ordinary meaning of this term? For example, application framework code is configured to detect changes to web application screens – while the canned actions are clearly not configured to detect changes to web applications screens. See also paragraph 0035 for a further indication that a canned action is not within the ordinary meaning of application framework code, e.g. "the application framework 410 also acts as a conduit between the web browser request (in the form of a URL address) and the interaction of the graphics (prepared by the graphic designers/business analysts 210)."

Will an amendment along these lines make moot the rejection of record based on Lindhorst (which again discusses the retrieval of canned actions)?

A second point for the agenda is as follows:

In the interest of expediting prosecution, we wish to also add some new dependent claims as alternative possible bases for finding allowable subject matter when the new search is conducted. Please review, in particular, paragraph 0053. The generation of the application framework code is bypassed in certain conditions, even if no application framework code has been generated for the particular input format. See paragraph 0053, last five lines in particular. I wish to solicit any suggestions you may have on drafting these new claims, again in the interest of trying to expedite prosecution.